



CITY COUNCIL RAIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Special Meeting
Thursday, April 25, 2013

Chair Shepherd called the meeting to order at 8:59 A.M. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Burt, Klein, Shepherd (Chair)

Absent: Kniss

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 28, 2013

MOTION: Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to approve the February 28, 2013 minutes as presented.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0, Kniss Absent

3. Updates

- a. California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA)
- b. Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB)
 1. Advanced Preemption Project for Safety
- c. Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC)
- d. Caltrain Local Policymaker Group
- e. Caltrans State Rail Plan

John Garamendi Jr., Professional Evaluation Group, Inc., reported the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) meeting on April 4, 2013, was long and complicated with a tremendous amount of public comment regarding route selection between Bakersfield and Fresno. In general, very little was discussed that concerned Palo Alto.

MINUTES

Council Member Burt inquired whether Mr. Garamendi had an update regarding changes in the bid and award process.

Mr. Garamendi would address that in Agenda Item Number 4.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Shepherd to consolidate Agenda Item Numbers 3 and 4 to be heard together.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0, Kniss absent

Mr. Garamendi continued to meet with Staff. Senate Bill (SB) 557, Senator Hill's bill, was heard on Tuesday, and there did not appear to be any organized opposition to the bill. Legislative staff proposed adding a sunset provision to SB 557. Discussion of the sunset provision centered around sunsetting the financing component in 2018. Senator Hill did not accept the amendment, and the bill would return to committee the following week. He was less concerned about 2018 than 2025, and suggested to Senator Hill that it would be difficult for Palo Alto to accept a sunset provision. A sunset provision was not in Palo Alto's interest according to the Guiding Principles. Palo Alto's interest in the bill concerned the two-track blended system. He did not expect more than two tracks before 2018, and suggested the sunset provision be placed on the Rail Committee's (Committee) Agenda for discussion.

Chair Shepherd indicated the provision could be discussed as part of updates.

Mr. Garamendi assumed a sunset provision was not acceptable to the Committee, but would like the Committee to provide direction.

Chair Shepherd inquired whether a sunset provision for the finance component meant there would not be further debate regarding future funding sources.

Mr. Garamendi indicated it would be very difficult to put the sunset provision on the finance component, because CHSRA probably would not support it. A sunset provision around financing meant after 2018 if all funds were not expended, then it would be an open question as to when that could occur. He asked if Palo Alto would support a sunset provision regarding the two-track and blended system.

Chair Shepherd asked how a sunset provision would affect Palo Alto.

MINUTES

Mr. Garamendi explained the impact for Palo Alto would come from a sunset provision on the legislation. When the CHSRA reached the two track versus four track question in 2018, there would be no protection. The financing part was a little more nuanced, because funds were expected to be expended by that time period. It created a deadline, which was consistent with SB 1029.

Council Member Klein agreed not to accept a sunset provision.

Chair Shepherd also agreed, and felt a sunset could occur when Phase 2 was completed. She was troubled by the removal of the Altamont Pass from the route system. The whole burden of the build out would fall on the Peninsula without the Altamont Pass route. She wished to have language securing the Altamont route prior to this bill sunseting.

Mr. Garamendi also continued to track SB 525, which would be presented to the Senate Environmental Quality Committee on May 1, 2013. Senator Hill was chairman of the committee. This legislation added exemptions to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for improvements to the Altamont route. He assumed Palo Alto would be concerned about exemptions regarding High Speed Rail (HSR). SB 731, CEQA legislation, was introduced on April 23, 2013 by Senator Steinberg. He had not fully analyzed SB 731 to determine its impacts on Palo Alto. It did not contain a broad exemption for HSR.

Council Member Klein asked if there were any newspaper stories concerning SB 731.

Mr. Garamendi answered yes.

Chair Shepherd requested Mr. Garamendi work with the City Attorney regarding SB 731, because she was the attorney for the League of Cities CEQA Watch.

Mr. Garamendi noted Palo Alto was concerned about CEQA in more areas than just HSR. He continued to watch for last minute bills, but typically bills would be proposed and amended after May 2013. The Brady lawsuit continued, and a hearing was scheduled for May 31, 2013. The Central Valley farmers' CEQA lawsuit settled the prior week; however farmers remained opposed to HSR. The farmers were not precluded from further litigation. Bids were opened and the contract awarded to Tutor for a construction project in the Central Valley; however, a great deal of controversy concerned changes in the bidding process approved by the

MINUTES

CHSRA Board. The CHSRA gave the manager of HSR authority to make some changes, and the issue would be the definition of substantial change.

Council Member Burt stated some would argue the change in process was not substantial.

Mr. Garamendi agreed. The moves resulting from that were unclear at the current time.

Council Member Klein questioned why the unsuccessful bidders did not sue the CHSRA, and inquired whether Mr. Garamendi had heard discussion of litigation.

Mr. Garamendi had not heard anything. In a project of this magnitude, most construction companies would be cautious because of future bidding opportunities.

Council Member Klein inquired about stories that the successful bidder had a long history of recouping its low bid through significant change orders.

Mr. Garamendi indicated that was the story as reported by newspapers. The company was politically savvy. It would be interesting to see how the State and the Senate Transportation Committee responded.

Council Member Burt recalled Dan Richard made a big deal about the bidding process when it was announced. The questions were how would the CHSRA Board respond, and whether Board Members acted independently or as supporters of Mr. Richard.

Mr. Garamendi agreed that would be the key part of the next CHSRA meeting. The Board generally supported Mr. Richard; however, there had been dissent recently.

Council Member Burt suggested that the political pressure would be for Board Members to disprove they were solely supporters of Mr. Richard. This would force Board Members to meet their obligations.

Council Member Klein inquired whether the CHSRA Board formally awarded the construction contract.

Mr. Garamendi responded no.

MINUTES

Chair Shepherd asked if there was any connection between the Board and bidders regarding gifts of tours in China.

Mr. Garamendi stated the internet was filled with rumors on this issue, but he did not have any facts. Board Members had to disclose conflicts.

Chair Shepherd noted disclosures for CHSRA were different from Council Member disclosures.

Mr. Garamendi reported Chairman Richard abstained from the vote on bidding, because he had some prior relationships.

Council Member Burt indicated Chairman Richard had a prior relationship with Parsons Transportation, and Parsons was a key subcontractor in the proposal. Chairman Richard had authority to change the process to favor a company with which he had a conflict, and then he recused himself from the vote.

Mr. Garamendi read that. The San Francisco Transportation Board was reviewing the application by HSR, but he would be surprised if HSR received an exemption. The bids would be a major issue and could lead to litigation.

Council Member Klein inquired about the date on which the Board would hear the issue.

Mr. Garamendi reported the Board would not approve the bids at the upcoming meeting, but it would be discussed.

Council Member Burt understood changes in the bidding process were made quite some time ago, and asked if the changes simply were not disclosed.

Mr. Garamendi was unsure of the exact date, but was confident SB 1029 passed prior to the changes in the bidding process.

Council Member Burt was interested in having that verified.

Council Member Klein inquired whether the CHSRA had purchased any of the needed land.

Mr. Garamendi answered no. To his knowledge, the CHSRA had not purchased any property.

MINUTES

Chair Shepherd asked if the CHSRA had explained the process for purchasing property.

Mr. Garamendi understood the CHSRA would follow all rules and procedures, and purchases would be made in accordance with Caltrans guidelines for similar projects.

Council Member Klein did not understand how construction could begin in the summer if no land was purchased.

Mr. Garamendi was not familiar with the formula, but the CHSRA believed construction would begin.

4. Report From the Professional Evaluation Group, Inc.

Chair Shepherd noted public speakers regarding Agenda Item Numbers 3 and 4.

Steve Eittreim, Mid Peninsula Men's Group, felt deep tunneling of the train tracks should not be ruled out. Tunneling had a high cost; however, it would not interfere with surface infrastructure and would generate surface space for development. With the large amount of capital in the private sector, perhaps there could be a public-private partnership for tunneling.

Roland Lebrun stated the Committee had to support Senator Hill's bill. Unless funds were expended by 2018, funds would return to the Central Valley. Tutor built the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) extension in San Bruno. Construction of grade separations in San Bruno revealed stuff under the tracks left by Tutor. Regarding the CHSRA bidding process, Morris Brown's videos on YouTube were worth viewing.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, reported the only information he had for Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC), Caltrain Local Policymaker Group, and Caltrans State Rail Plan was next meetings.

Chair Shepherd inquired whether advance preemption had been in the news recently.

Jamie Rodriguez, Chief Transportation Officer, reported Caltrain would implement a railroad safety program that was discussed in the media. Caltrain approached Staff more than a year ago with interest in a railroad preemption project. That work was confined to work within the trackway,

MINUTES

and included upgrades to electrical facilities and trackway monitoring and detection systems for the train itself. It was not concerned with any infrastructure outside of the railroad right-of-way. Caltrain was performing other upgrades within various communities. Caltrain would upgrade to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards by adding audible elements. Staff performed traffic signal cabinet upgrades about 1 1/2 years ago, because cabinets were aging. Also Caltrain would upgrade the cabling system between the railroad house structure and the City's traffic signal cabinet. Caltrain was upgrading crossings at Alma Street and Churchill Avenue and Alma Street and Meadow Drive. Caltrain considered crossings that provided the most optimal advance preemption detection opportunities.

Chair Shepherd asked if upgrades would occur at the Alma Street crossing and the Churchill Avenue crossing, not the two southern crossings.

Mr. Rodriguez indicated Caltrain would upgrade crossings at Alma Street and Churchill Avenue and Alma Street and Meadow Drive, not at the Alma Street and Charleston Road crossing.

Council Member Burt inquired whether Caltrain's reason for not upgrading the Charleston Road crossing was greater capacity due to four lanes of traffic.

Mr. Rodriguez understood from speaking with Caltrain that Caltrain was not able to gain advance preemption opportunities at Charleston Road. The reason did not concern the amount of roadways or lanes.

Council Member Burt requested Staff obtain additional explanation for that analysis.

Mr. Rodriguez would do so. At a typical intersection, a signal without railroad preemption operated as if demand was everywhere at all times. The four main sequences of the traffic signal were left-turn lanes moving together, followed by the through movements together, followed by the westbound approach, and finally the eastbound approach. With railroad preemption, a traffic signal required up to 4 seconds to end whatever movement it was on. There was only 3 seconds of yellow for the tracks across Charleston Road. Four seconds was the maximum amount of time to terminate any movement when the Caltrain call came in. The yellow transition was followed by 2 seconds of all red at the intersection; that sequence was the City's standard setup for traffic signal controllers. Following the all red movement, the track clearance section began in which movement across the trackways received green. Simultaneously with green

MINUTES

for movement across the tracks, the gate arms began to flash over the roadway and sidewalks. The green lasted for 12 seconds to clear anyone off the trackway. Gate arms flashed for 6 seconds before they dropped over the roadway. The main difference advance preemption was the time at which the sequence began and the time at which the gate arms began to flash and drop. As soon as a train call was received, the gate arms began to flash, the transition of yellow to red for movement began, then clearing the trackways, followed by 3 seconds of yellow, and 1 second of all red. That was the typical 22 second scenario to transition traffic movement and clear vehicles from the tracks. By the 23rd second, the railroad dwell sequence began, which meant only certain movements could occur while the gate arms were down. In Palo Alto only the northbound and southbound movements of Alma Street remained green. He felt strongly that only the northbound and southbound movement should be allowed. The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) upgraded all intersections before crossings to add extinguishable no-right-turn signs that flashed at the sustained time while the gate arms flashed. The crossing would be in the dwell phase for as long as Caltrain needed to clear the track. That amount of time depended on the speed of the train as it approached the intersection. Once the train cleared the tracks at Charleston Road and Churchill Avenue, the signaling remained green for as long as there was demand on the northbound and southbound approach. That was the typical railroad preemption sequence in Palo Alto. With advance preemption, the train notification occurred sooner. Part of Caltrain's upgrades would include additional sensors and monitoring equipment beyond the current locations. He understood Caltrain was limited in where it could place the additional monitoring equipment. The two best opportunities to extend the monitoring gear outside of current locations were at Meadow Drive and Churchill Avenue. The benefit of advance preemption was the transition to clearance of movement over the tracks before the gate arms began flashing. Caltrain indicated there would be approximately 4-6 seconds of gain. With ten preemptions in a peak hour at 6 seconds each, that was an extra minute that would impact the corridor. In his example, the gate arms would begin to flash when the eastbound green began. Staff would likely maintain the green for 12 seconds. The difference was that Caltrain could choose to drop the gate arms at the same time. He felt Caltrain would choose to have an initial warning period. Advance preemption meant that the motorist in front of the tracks would have a warning not to move forward. Hopefully there would be fewer conflicts. Lead lag operations currently occurred at Alma Street and Meadow Drive. At the Meadow Drive intersection, Staff modified the signal phasing after an initial analysis. Caltrain would change the signal phasing at Churchill Avenue when upgrades were implemented.

MINUTES

At the Meadow Drive crossing, the southbound through movement was the start of a cycle of an intersection. If there was no demand on the left turn, then the left turn terminated. Next, through traffic moved together, followed by the northbound left turn while the southbound stopped. Finally, the westbound and eastbound traffic cleared the tracks. With advance preemption, the change at Churchill Avenue would be a big benefit for traffic flowing to Palo Alto High School in the morning. Recovering from railroad preemption was different. In the current operations at Churchill Avenue and Charleston Road, the signal remained green on Alma Street until there was no more demand or up to 60 seconds. After the train call terminated, the green on Alma Street lasted for only 10 seconds. At the 11th second, signals moved to yellow then red for the southbound movement to allow the northbound movement. This would be helpful at Charleston Road because of the high demand. The City would perform the last lead lag at Charleston Road.

Council Member Burt stated at Churchill Avenue morning capacity to turn left would improve. There would be more flow after a train passed, because the left turn signal would be green sooner and hold longer.

Mr. Rodriguez agreed.

Council Member Burt inquired about the impact on congestion along Churchill Avenue between El Camino Real and (INAUDIBLE). He asked if a right-turn from Churchill Avenue onto El Camino Real was being planned. If the future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) also had preemption on El Camino Real, then the preemptions could conflict.

Mr. Rodriguez asked if he meant an impact to the eastbound Churchill Avenue movement trying to get back to Alma Street.

Council Member Burt was asking about westbound traffic toward El Camino Real.

Mr. Rodriguez reported the eastbound movement received a green faster than the current time, because Staff programmed 60 seconds of green time for northbound and southbound traffic. Because the movement followed the dwell phase, the northbound left turn had a shorter time. Once westbound traffic cleared, then the eastbound movement began approximately 15 seconds sooner. On the westbound approach towards El Camino Real, there was a proposed project in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 that included a study for the design phase of the right-turn from westbound Churchill Avenue to northbound El Camino Real. Staff

MINUTES

applied for a One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) for that specific project, but did not have OBAG results.

Council Member Burt inquired about the El Camino Real BRT station.

Mr. Rodriguez indicate that VTA was not recommending a BRT operation or station at the Churchill Avenue or Embarcadero Road intersections. The OBAG project recommended BRT-like stations at Churchill Avenue and Embarcadero Road to support the major regional sporting events that occurred at Stanford. Preemption already existed along El Camino Real as part of the existing BRT line. There should not be any change in the future.

Roland Lebrun noted Charleston Road was not in the budget. Caltrain would add 6-14 seconds, but did not indicate which intersections received 6 seconds and which received 14 seconds. That was the reason for Staff placing xx in the timings, because they did not know.

Mr. Rodriguez agreed Caltrain had not made that information available.

Mr. Lebrun reported a quad gate should not lower if there was something on the tracks.

Chair Shepherd noted quad gates had been discussed but not installed in Palo Alto. That would be a significant change.

Mr. Rodriguez reported Palo Alto had the typical two-gate operation, meaning two gates lowered to block access to traffic for the approaching movements. Quad gates were four gates, one for the approach and one for the release side. The railroads were completely blocked so drivers could not drive around a gate arm. The only issue with quad gates was the need for additional studies. If presignals were implemented, then an impact would be no right-turn-on-red movements for all eastbound approaches of the intersections that crossed Alma Street. That could be a significant impact to neighborhoods located west of the trackways. His examples did not attempt to model High Speed Rail (HSR) benefits or changes in the Caltrain operations.

5. Discussion of the Preliminary Cost Estimates for Grade Separation and Trenching Studies

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, recalled at the prior Rail Committee (Committee) meeting Staff was directed to follow up with Hatch

MINUTES

Mott MacDonald regarding the cost to design and construct either a trench for the railroad or submerged roadway grade separations. The cost for a 10 percent design for the four grade separations would be approximately \$1 million. The cost for a 10 percent design for trenching in Palo Alto would be approximately \$1.5 million. However, Hatch Mott MacDonald could use industry standards and generic assumptions to provide a fairly accurate cost range for either of those scenarios. Those numbers would not be as detailed or as accurate as the 10 percent design, and there would be ambiguity related to the cost for utility relocation and property acquisition. Staff requested direction regarding the nexus between cost and accuracy for one of these studies and which questions were more important to have answered.

Chair Shepherd inquired if a cost savings would result from blending the two bids.

Chris Metzger, Professional Engineer from Hatch Mott MacDonald, reported field investigation was premature at the current time. They could locate enough existing data to help the Committee make decisions. They could study both options, and prepare comparisons and contrasts and impact analyses on both ideas.

Council Member Burt wanted to ensure the Committee was not considering a design study. One of the key elements was property acquisition with respect to at-grade crossings versus submerged or partially submerged tracks. He hoped the study could be performed on a preliminary basis without having site visits. He suggested the study consider the range of costs and impacts of the alternatives.

Mr. Metzger stated ample information was available to use for this type of study. From available information, they could provide information regarding ultimate configurations that would work in the limits of those configurations and the range of impacts from the ultimate configuration. Another element could be the impacts during construction. Lastly, they could provide some cost elements. Utilities would be a large component, and they could provide impacts and costs for utility work. They could perform that work to a level that would allow the Committee to make decisions or at least discuss the alternatives.

Council Member Klein inquired about the numbers in the 2011 study.

Mr. Hackmann recalled the range of \$25,000-\$30,000 per linear foot was the cost of constructing a two-track trench only. That did not include any

MINUTES

auxiliary costs. Constructing 4 miles or approximately 21,000 feet of trench would total in the range of \$500-\$650 million.

Council Member Klein asked why Mr. Hackmann used 4 miles.

Mr. Hackmann explained 4 miles was the approximate length of the corridor in Palo Alto.

Council Member Klein reiterated a cost of \$500-\$600 million.

Mr. Hackmann understood the 2011 study did not include auxiliary costs for shoe fly tracks or temporary roadway constructions.

Mr. Metzger reported the 2011 study focused on changes from a base condition and the additional costs. The study the Committee was interested in was substantially different, because it would consider total project costs.

Council Member Burt inquired whether the 2011 study included rough estimates of elevated or submerged grade separations.

Mr. Hackmann stated the study did not look at grade separations.

Chair Shepherd liked Mr. Metzger's comments regarding how to limit the study. It was important for the community to understand the magnitude of this project. He inquired about the possible cost of a high level preliminary analysis.

Mr. Metzger indicated a feasibility study would cost in the range of \$100,000. He wanted to know the Committee's major concerns in order to focus on them. The cost also would depend on the interaction level with the community itself.

Chair Shepherd asked if interaction meant community meetings and citizen outreach.

Mr. Metzger answered yes. With a larger group, he usually had to present the information in multiple formats.

Chair Shepherd was interested in property acquisitions and construction phase. She wanted to understand the reasons why an option was not feasible.

MINUTES

Mr. Metzger stated the construction methodology would add greatly to the project cost.

Chair Shepherd asked if Hatch Mott MacDonald was involved in the design of the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Berryessa trenching project.

Mr. Metzger was the engineering manager for the project over the prior three years. On that project, there were hundreds of different property acquisitions. The study could review the properties that would be impacted.

Chair Shepherd inquired about cost overruns for the Berryessa project.

Mr. Metzger reported costs were trending well with no major issues.

Chair Shepherd indicated the next step was for Hatch Mott MacDonald to work with Staff to refine the proposal after learning the Committee's interests.

Mr. Metzger assumed cost was a material reason for eliminating an alternative. Impacts could also be a material reason.

Chair Shepherd wanted to understand the options, and assumed trenching and tunneling were probably the most expensive form of reconfiguring the railway. A range of costs for the construction phase and the build phase were also needed.

Mr. Metzger reported the less expensive alternative was always to move the roadway. Grade separations were expected to be the lower cost, but they were not necessarily the best in terms of final construction costs. There could be many substantial benefits from having a trench. With this study, the Committee could use costs of grade separations and trenching to extrapolate the costs of a tunnel.

Council Member Burt left the meeting at 10:20 A.M. and returned at 10:25 A.M.

Chair Shepherd announced the meeting was back in session.

Mr. Hackmann inquired whether Mr. Metzger needed additional information from the Committee to draft a fee proposal for a feasibility study.

MINUTES

Mr. Metzger inquired whether a roadway closure should be considered when looking at constructability.

Council Member Burt referenced the Guiding Principles regarding no permanent roadway closure; however he would like recommendations on whether temporary closures were necessary.

Chair Shepherd asked if he meant east-west traffic or the possibility of using Alma Street for fly tracks.

Mr. Metzger meant less traffic. Another concern was potential or planned projects for the area. He would work with Staff regarding projects in order to provide a better study.

Mr. Hackmann indicated Staff would provide that information.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to continue Agenda Item Number 5 to a date uncertain and to have Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, continue to work with Hatch Mott MacDonald to revise their proposal as a feasibility study.

Council Member Burt felt the Committee could have a more informed conversation at the next meeting.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0, Kniss Absent

6. Discussion of a Draft Letter on Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Member Configuration

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, reported the concept of the letter was to recommend to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) that one of the three positions on the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) be represented by a member from VTA Group 2, which was representative of the cities of Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Mountain View, and Palo Alto. Currently there was no representation on the PCJPB from Group 2 despite the fact that the region was home to the second and third busiest Caltrain stations on the line. The draft letter recommended VTA make that internal change to better represent Caltrain ridership. Council Member Burt noted the Caltrain Local Policymaker Group was never intended to be a true policymaking body, and revised the letter to remove that sentence. Council Member Burt also revised the letter to place more emphasis on the fact that Palo Alto was the second busiest station on the line.

MINUTES

Council Member Burt did not believe the letter should dwell on the Local Policymaker Group, because that diluted the request. He also emphasized Palo Alto's position on ridership within Santa Clara County and secondarily the whole system. Based on Caltrain's recent boardings , he believed 75 percent was accurate.

Mr. Hackmann assumed boardings were based on the 2012 study.

Council Member Klein agreed with Council Member Burt's suggested changes with one exception. The letter should focus on getting a member on the agency that made decisions. The phrase regarding the importance to Palo Alto was self-serving and removed the focus on ridership levels.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to revise the draft letter entitled "Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Group 2 Representation on the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board" to: a) not focus the content of the letter on the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB); b) to emphasize where the City of Palo Alto stood on the issue of ridership; and c) to revise the third sentence to read: The City of Palo Alto has long been interested in the PCJPB representation structure being updated to more accurately reflect ridership levels ~~and the importance of the system to Palo Alto.~~

Council Member Burt agreed with deleting the phrase, but it was implicitly connected to ridership. The Caltrain system was not as important to a city with a few hundred boardings.

Chair Shepherd inquired about the organization of VTA appointments, and the process to change appointments.

Mr. Hackmann reported each county decided how to appoint their three members. That fact was reflected in the different structures. He could research the issue and provide information at a later time.

Chair Shepherd wanted to understand the logistical process of requesting a change.

Council Member Klein explained the basic problem was San Jose having half the population of Santa Clara County. Because VTA was supported by a Countywide sales tax, it became a Countywide system. VTA was the obvious body to choose the three county representatives on the PCJPB. The compromise was having the zones configured such that San Jose could not have a majority on all issues. The problem of a majority from San Jose

MINUTES

constituting the majority of the VTA remained. The letter requested a carve out to reflect the realities of the ridership for this particular function of VTA.

Chair Shepherd inquired whether all of Santa Clara County had to vote on a reorganization.

Council Member Klein answered no.

Chair Shepherd asked if there was a method to identify the city appointments that contained Caltrain stations.

Council Member Burt indicated that issue would be important in a detailed discussion. Within Group 2, only Mountain View and Palo Alto had stations. The City had a very good representative on VTA from Los Altos Hills; however, a Mountain View and Palo Alto representation would be important with respect to Caltrain. He asked if Staff had spoken with Mountain View on the subject.

Mr. Hackmann replied no.

Chair Shepherd inquired whether Staff should contact Mountain View regarding a joint letter prior to sending the letter.

Council Member Burt did not know if Staff could move quickly, but it was not an urgent matter.

Council Member Klein agreed with attempting to obtain Mountain View's cooperation.

Mr. Hackmann asked if the Rail Committee (Committee) wished Staff to obtain Council approval of the letter prior to or after talking with Mountain View.

Council Member Klein preferred sending the letter, and then attempting to work with Mountain View. There was no urgency, but he did not want to spend three or four months negotiating with Mountain View.

Council Member Burt would support approving the letter, but engaging Mountain View prior to sending it. Mountain View should be aware of Palo Alto's position prior to sending the letter.

Council Member Klein felt that was a good compromise.

MINUTES

Chair Shepherd asked if Staff should send the same information to Los Altos and Los Altos Hills.

Mr. Hackmann could send a letter to the appropriate City Managers.

Council Member Burt believed unifying the Group 2 cities would be important for success.

Roland Lebrun noted Caltrain would announce the latest ridership numbers by May 2, 2013, and the letter could be delayed until those numbers were announced.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER: to send a copy of the letter to the cities of Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, and Mountain View.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0, Kniss absent

8. Future Meetings and Agendas
 - a. Update on Efforts to Obtain Dedicated Funding for Caltrain
 - b. Status of Litigation Against the CHSRA
 - c. Update on the Caltrain Gate Crossing & Traffic Analysis Study

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, announced the next meeting was scheduled for May 23, 2013, the Thursday before Memorial Day weekend. He asked if there was interest in changing the date.

Council Member Burt agreed with meeting on May 23, 2013.

Council Member Klein agreed to May 23.

Chair Shepherd also agreed.

Mr. Hackmann reported he placed an update on rail issues on the Council's tentative Agenda for May 20, 2013. He would provide both the revised Guiding Principles and the draft letter that night.

Council Member Burt would be absent on May 20, 2013.

MINUTES

ADJOURNMENT: This meeting was adjourned at 10:45 A.M.